

## **REMARKS**

These remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action dated May 9, 2008. Claims 23-28 have been rejected. Claims 44-60 are pending in the present application. Claims 44 and 48 have been changed, and claims 54-60 have been added by this amendment. A telephone interview was held with the Examiner in which issues and some of the dependent claim suggestions were discussed as presented herein.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 44 and 48. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by previous claims is not patentable over art cited by the Examiner. Claims 44 and 48 have been changed in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims directed to the subject matter encompassed by former claims and any other claims in one or more continuing and/or divisional applications.

No new matter has been added. The amendments to claims 44 and 48, and new claim 54, regarding receiving selection of predicates, adding predicates to a displayed search condition, grouping the predicates, and displaying a query search condition are supported in the specification on pages 11, lines 15-18 and page 11, line 23 to page 12, line 16, for example. New claims 56 and 57 recite forming a query statement, processing the query statement and using a model content provider, and are supported in the specification on pages 16 and 19-22, for example. New claim 58 is supported on pages 22-23, claim 59 is supported on page 28, and claim 60 is supported on page 21, lines 1-2, for example. Thus, no new matter has been added.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 44-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,089 to Mocek et al. (hereinafter “Mocek”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,897 to Rubinstein (hereinafter “Rubinstein”). Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention and to expedite prosecution.

Claim 44 recites a method for creating a query search condition through a user interface, including displaying column names and column operators, and generating a list of all column values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column name and the selected column operator. Claim 44 also recites receiving selection of at least two predicates in a query search condition, and grouping the selected predicates based on a user selection of a displayed grouping control, the grouping controlling the order in which the first and second predicates are evaluated with respect to at least one unselected predicate of the query search condition.

Mocek and Rubenstein do not disclose or suggest selecting predicates in a query search condition, and grouping selected predicates based on a user selection of a displayed grouping control as recited in claim 44. For example, Mocek discloses displaying a SQL select statement (Fig. 3K), but mentions nothing about selecting predicates and grouping them with a displayed grouping control to control the order of their evaluation with respect to unselected predicates, as recited in claim 44. Rubenstein provides an interface for selecting keyword phrases to search for, but does not disclose the features of selecting and grouping predicates as recited in claim 44. Claim 44 is therefore believed patentable over Mocek in view of Rubenstein.

Claims 45-53 are dependent from claim 44 and are patentable over Mocek in view of Rubenstein for at least the same reasons as claim 44, and for additional reasons. For example, claim 48 recites forming the predicate and displaying the query search condition and predicates, the selection of at least two predicates being from the displayed query search condition. Mocek and Rubenstein do not disclose or suggest selecting displayed predicates from a displayed query search condition for grouping as recited.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 44-53 are patentable over Mocek in view of Rubenstein.

### New Claims

New claims 54-60 are dependent from claim 44 and are patentable over Mocek in view of Rubenstein for at least the same reasons as claim 44, and for additional reasons. For example, claim 54

recites displaying the search condition and predicates and selecting from displayed predicates which is not disclosed or suggested by Mocek in view of Rubenstein.

Claim 56 recites forming a query statement based on, at least in part, the selections in the user interface, and processing the query statement into a form defined by a query model. The processing includes using content viewers to interface to an application that uses the user interface and to process the query statement into query information independent of a specific structure. This includes using one of multiple API-specific content viewers to interface with a particular GUI API used by the application, each API-specific content viewer usable with an associated one of a plurality of different available graphical user interface (GUI) APIs, and using a non-specific content viewer in communication with the API-specific content viewers to provide the query information. A model content provider is used to receive the query information and translate the query information into the form defined by the query model, the form including item provider objects that are instances of query model elements of the query model and that include query model relationships of the query model.

Mocek and Rubenstein do not disclose or suggest forming a query statement based on the user selections in the user interface, and processing the query statement into a form defined by a query model, including using a model content viewer and a plurality of content viewers including an API-specific content viewer and non-specific content viewer, as recited in claim 56. For example, Mocek discloses the display of database management information and the translation of a database command to natural language, but mentions nothing about processing a query statement into a form defined by a query model, nor the use of content viewers to process the query statement and interface with an application, nor using a model content provider receiving query information from a content viewer, as recited in claim 44. Rubenstein provides an interface for browsing documents using keyword phrases and linguistic analysis, and does not disclose the features of processing a query statement into a form defined by a query model using content viewers and model content provider as recited in claim 56. Claim 56 is therefore believed patentable over Mocek in view of Rubenstein.

Claim 57 recites that the API-specific content viewers process item provider objects for structures specific to the associated GUI API; claim 58 recites processing a query statement into the form of the query model including defining parent nodes, child nodes, and subtype child nodes; claim 59 recites using the model content provider includes adding at least one proxy item to replace a reference to another form and reestablishing the reference; and claim 60 recites creating the item provider objects dynamically as the query statement is formed. These features are not disclosed or suggested by Mocek and Rubenstein.

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: August 01, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./  
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 30,801  
(650) 475-1449